UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Free Religion: An American Faith - - - - - - - - - *Peter H. Samsom*

Preparation for Parenthood - *Ethel S. Beer*

Spinoza's Influence on Philosophy, Religion, and Daily Life - - *Leonard B. Gray*

Wings on His Casket - *Harold P. Marley*

Faces Are Peculiar - *Manfred A. Carter*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXIV NUMBER I

Chicago, March-April, 1948

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Ethel S. Beer: Author of *Day Nursery.*

Manfred A. Carter: Minister of the Eddington Methodist Church, Eddington, Maine.

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian-Congregational Church in Brooklyn, New York.

Leonard B. Gray: Minister of the First Church of Christ (Congregational) in Lynn, Massachusetts.

John H. Hershey: A Unitarian minister living in Bridgewater, Massachusetts.

Homer A. Jack: Executive Secretary, Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination.

Geoffrey Johnson: Contributor to many leading English, American, and Canadian periodicals.

Harold P. Marley: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Dayton, Ohio.

Peter H. Samsom: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of San Diego, California.

Kenneth C. Walker: Minister of The Unitarian Church of Bloomington, Illinois.

James M. Yard: Executive Director of the Chicago Round Table of Christians and Jews.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 3

ARTICLES—

Free Religion: An American Faith—PETER H. SAMSOM 4

Preparation for Parenthood—ETHEL S. BEER 7

Spinoza's Influence on Philosophy, Religion and Daily Life—LEONARD B. GRAY 9

Wings on His Casket—HAROLD P. MARLEY 12

Faces Are Peculiar—MANFRED A. CARTER 13

POETRY—

Over There—GEOFFREY JOHNSON 14

THE STUDY TABLE—

Albert Schweitzer—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 14

The Language of Jesus—C. A. HAWLEY 15

Philosophy and Life—KENNETH C. WALKER 16

Unitarian Saint—CURTIS W. REESE 16

Democratic Education—JAMES M. YARD 16

Artistic Production—RANDALL S. HILTON 17

Towards Global Religion—JOHN H. HERSHEY 17

Alternatives to Traditional Religion—HOMER A. JACK 17

CORRESPONDENCE—

Reply to Mr. Hammand—GLENN P. TURNER 18

Recollections—A. N. FOSTER 18

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 19

THE FIELD—

Poetry and Preaching 2

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Poetry and Preaching

Albert Ralph Korn, President of The American Literary Association, is offering an award of $100.00 for the best poem submitted. Any subject acceptable. Only one poem to be entered by each contestant. Poems not to exceed 24 lines. All poets residing in the U.S.A., Canada, and Great Britain may compete. Manuscripts should be typewritten and carry name and address of contestant. No manuscripts returned. Poets should keep copy of their submission. Original poems only. Author retains all rights. The winner will be announced in October, 1948, and award made then. Judges will be Marguerite Janvrin Adams, Leslie Nelson Jennings, Albert Ralph Korn. Mail all entries to P. O. Box 43, Lenox Hill Station, New York 21, N. Y. Clara Catherine Prince was founder of The American Literary Association and is at present Editor in Chief of The American Poetry Magazine, official publication of the Association.

Albert Ralph Korn is also giving a $50.00 prize for an essay not exceeding 750 words on the subject, "The Advantages of Clarity in Poetry." Judges will be Leslie Nelson Jennings and Albert Ralph Korn. Award will be made in December, 1948. Manuscripts should be typewritten and carry author's name and address. No material returned. Send all entries to P. O. Box 43, Lenox Hill Station, New York 21, N. Y.

For the past year, *The Churchman* has been giving a citation each week for the best sermon submitted to it on the subject of good will and better understanding. Each of these sermons has been read at 9:15 Sunday morning over Station WOR (New York) by a distinguished representative of the theatre, the professions, or business. Awards of $1,000, $500, and $250 will be given for the three best sermons received during the year.

The program will be continued during 1948. Clergymen of any denomination may submit sermons which have been preached to a con-

(*Continued on page* 8)

UNITY

Volume CXXXIV MARCH-APRIL, 1948 No. 1

EDITORIAL

This is a time for sober thought and speech. America is faced with decisions that require the maximum of responsible consideration. Neither flamboyant patriotism nor unrealistic idealism will serve any good purpose. Inflamed emotions and utopian hopes offer no wise counsel. What brought about the present world crisis is of historical but not current importance. The stern fact is that America must decide whether the future is to be open for democratic liberty within nations and voluntary cooperation between nations or a closed system of state dictation and enforced conformity. Our decision must be made with full awareness of the consequences. America cannot remain an island of freedom in a totalitarian world. Calmly and with full knowledge of the cost we must take our stand against the further spread of Russian dictatorship. This will entail long run firmness of purpose and enormous expenditures of power. It will require wisdom and deep understanding in dealing with our natural allies. We cannot and should not impose our particular ideas of economic arrangements upon our associates in the struggle to maintain a world in which basic freedoms shall prevail, nor must we forget the areas of our own societal life where democratic freedoms do not exist. While battling for freedom abroad we must maintain the maximum possible freedom at home. We should make it plain that we are not opposing the spread of Communist thought by educational and peaceful means but that we are opposing the spread of the Soviet Russian system by force and violence. These are solemn responsibilities and they will require grim determination. The future can be kept open for the development of liberty under law but it will require on our part integrity of purpose, overwhelming power, and enormous resources. Solemnly and regretfully we must again take up the battle on a world scale against tyranny and for the freedom of man.

Curtis W. Reese.

Free Religion: An American Faith

PETER H. SAMSOM

Can men achieve such a thing as free religion? This is a question to which we liberals are often tempted to think we already have the answer, but which somehow keeps popping up and bothering us again as if it were a brand-new issue that had never been faced before. It is the most serious question before the Protestant churches today. Protestantism is facing one of the supreme crises and at the same time one of the finest opportunities of its entire history. A thousand observers, both critical and well-wishing, are asking the same question: Can our segmented Protestant Christianity surmount its divisions and present to the world a united message that is more concerned with saving the world from destruction than with putting across this or that creed or belief? Here and there are signs, as in the new church union of several Christian denominations in South India, that headway is being made toward a united church that includes a variety of creeds and is therefore to some extent, within the limits of Christianity, a free church with freedom of belief and unity of purpose. The same problem looms before Christians everywhere, the world over, faced as they are with a vast world crisis that cries desperately for the healing voice of intelligent, constructive religion. For the Catholic, this problem does not exist, for he has solved the question of freedom by denying it. But for Protestants it will be the problem of the next generation: Can men of varying beliefs unite in good works? Can you have a religious movement that places common purpose above creed? Can religion be freed from theology, at least to the extent that men of different creeds can join in common endeavor for the betterment of life? If the Protestant churches cannot see their way through this problem and emerge with a confident "Yes," then it is commonly agreed by most competent observers that Protestant Christianity is through as a significant force in the world's future.

Although we Unitarians have not always been eager to identify ourselves as Protestants, believing that our religious devotion is on the broad base of universal religion rather than bound to one particular revelation, nevertheless this fundamental question, "Can men achieve a free religion?", faces us too. It is even more serious for us, for we have always insisted on confronting men with the challenge of a religion free of dogma. Unless religion is free, unless men and women are free to believe according to their own best reason and the growing knowledge of man about his world, religion is a tyranny and a reactionary superstition, we have said; and we have put this faith in free religion into practice by deliberately subordinating such matters as creeds, theologies, rituals, and statements of belief to the things we consider to be closer to the heart of religion: namely the concerns of the ongoing life of humanity, and the responsibility of all of us to strengthen and enrich the life of man on earth. When you join a Unitarian Church, we have said, you do not bind yourself to a creedal statement of intellectual belief, but you express your willing sympathy with a creative, practical purpose, call it human or divine—the quest of the good life for all men—and you reserve for yourself the right to your own private beliefs and intellectual convictions.

Yet, though we say these things confidently and mean them seriously, we know, when we are most frank with ourselves, that we have not always practised fully what we have preached. We know that actually to practise this freedom, to be genuinely inclusive of all varieties of liberal religious belief, is not easy. Today there is something of a crisis in the whole Unitarian movement all over the country, and its storm center is this same question: Whether our faith can continue to include within its fellowship persons who do not fully agree on such vital religious matters as the existence and nature of God, a future life, prayer and worship, and the place of the Bible and Jesus in our thought. There are militant forces joining hands at this moment which are determined to see to it that Unitarian religion is cleansed of certain types of religious belief. These groups resent those whom they call the "Humanists", the "Secularists", and the "Naturalists," for they believe, doubtless sincerely, that no religious movement can exist and be healthy while such divergencies of belief exist within it. Certain Unitarians are blanketing the country today with printed matter, often scurrilous, that is finding its way into many Unitarian homes, and people who do not have access to the facts are puzzled and troubled by their wild accusations of "Communism," "Humanism," "Atheism," and "Secularism." They have been particularly distressed by the fact that certain people have not hesitated to make a sacrificial goat of the Unitarian Service Committee, smearing it as Communistically inclined because of its steadfast policy of "no discrimination" in its relief services. Our liberal fellowship is being strained at the seams by those who do not believe we can really be a free church, but that we must adopt some kind of a creed and show the door to those who cannot or will not subscribe to it.

I would like to approach the matter from a quite basic angle. A book has recently found its way to my desk which has something very definite and helpful to say about these troublesome difficulties that beset a free church from time to time. It suggests that what we are seeing now is no new problem, but a quite old and familiar one that has been wrestled with before. Indeed, it is a problem that the Unitarian movement itself has faced before in almost the same form. And the way in which it was settled then is of extremely vital interest to us, especially now.

The name of this book is *Free Religion—An American Faith.* It was written by a young history professor at Princeton by the name of Stow Persons, who has dug out for us a forgotten and exciting bit of American religious history—a chapter that is intimately concerned with the Unitarian movement but which has never received much attention. Its central issue is this question whether there can be such a thing as a free church which allows a wide latitude of belief while devoting its energies to the betterment of human living. The answer this segment of history has to offer is deeply worth knowing, for now, less than a century later, we are up against almost exactly the same problem. The light in which this book puts our Unitarian movement of a century ago is not always a complimentary one, but I believe we can stand that if the light it sheds gives

us a better understanding of what we are really involved in today, and this is just what it does, even though the events it tells of took place in 1865 instead of 1947. Change the characters and dates, and you would think you were reading about the latest development today!

The story Persons tells centers about the Free Religious Association, a small but vigorous movement that arose in revolt against what we can only call the hidebound orthodoxy and conservatism that dominated the Unitarian churches of the 1860s. How and why this revolt occurred, and what its results were for Unitarianism itself, give us some fascinating sidelights on our Unitarian past, and on the whole question of freedom in religion itself.

Let us recall that the Unitarian movement in America was a natural and direct outgrowth of the American Revolution itself. It was religion freeing itself from a hell-obsessed Calvinism, just as the new America was freeing itself from the bondage of the Old World. Unitarian religion appears squarely in the American tradition of revolt and non-conformity. It expresses the American democratic faith in reform, in the humanitarian spirit, and in personal freedom, and it puts into religious form the basic American faith that man is essentially good and capable of ordering his own affairs if given the freedom to do so. The book is fittingly entitled, *Free Religion—An American Faith,* though it makes it plain that the Unitarian movement has not always lived up to this compliment.

One of the sadder paradoxes of human life is that it seems to be the destiny of revolters and reformers to settle down and become static conservatives, and this has happened on occasion even to Unitarian religion. At the time of the Civil War, Unitarianism had developed a powerful and dominant orthodoxy. It was a small denomination which had had its great radicals, Channing, Emerson, and Parker, but was not altogether proud of them. Emerson had actually had to leave the Unitarian Church because it was too orthodox for him. The Unitarian of Civil War days disagreed with the orthodox Christian about the Trinity, but aside from that he seems to have accepted the then standard views of the divine inspiration of the Bible, belief in miracles, in the divine origin of the Christian religion, though some tried to lead the movement away from these time-worn fundamentals of Christian orthodoxy. In the field of social problems, the Unitarianism of that day seems to have been a timid, intellectual affair which left direct social action alone, in the belief that society would be regenerated only by the regeneration of individual men. Several noted Unitarian social reformers were outstanding exceptions to this pattern, but the support of the denomination was not behind them. The Unitarian Church saw itself in general as "Unitarian Christianity," basically and faithfully Christian, with a liberal emphasis. Despite Channing's ageless statement that "the ultimate reliance of a human being is and must be on his own mind," the Unitarian movement as a whole had not come so far yet, and placed little faith in the natural man. Channing himself summed up the situation neatly, as of a few decades earlier:

> It began as a protest against the rejection of reason—against mental slavery. It pledged itself to progress as its life and end; but has gradually grown stationary, and now we have a Unitarian orthodoxy. Perhaps this is not to be wondered at or deplored, for all reforming bodies seem doomed to stop, in order to keep the ground, much or little, which they have gained. They become conservative and out of them must spring new reformers, to be persecuted generally by the old.

But even in those days they were nonetheless typically Unitarian, in that there was a considerable minority who were far more progressive in every way than the orthodox majority. The radicals in those days were called Transcendentalists, and they were in a direct line from Emerson and Theodore Parker. Channing himself was not a Transcendentalist, but he was sympathetic with their freedom to speak and to be heard and to be considered just as good Unitarians as their more conservative brothers.

What was this Transcendentalism? It was a many-sided movement, each side of which represented a revolt against some reigning tradition. Its essential faith seems to have been that religion must free itself of the external encumbrances of creeds, rituals, and dead forms, and find its roots where they really are—in the soul of man. Its followers were Unitarians, and many even considered themselves faithful Christians but they were convinced that religion was a good deal broader than Christianity, and they wanted to get at religion itself, not merely to limit themselves to Christianity, one of its branches. They transferred religious authority from the Bible, where the Christians and orthodox Unitarians put it, to man's soul, from which the Bible itself had sprung. They denied any revelation through miracles, and refused to use the Communion service; it was this that cost Emerson his church in Boston. By way of positive belief, the Transcendentalists felt that Unitarianism was too much what Emerson had said it was—a religion of "pale negation"—and they wanted to strengthen its positive religious affirmations. They believed in a personal God, in a divinely ordained moral law, and in immortality, but they found their authority for these beliefs in the heart and soul and experience of man himself, rather than in the Christian revelation or in the Bible. They felt that ultimately there would be but one universal creedless religion for all mankind, based on what was revealed in the human soul, a religion devoted to the betterment of human life. They were especially outstanding among the Unitarians of that day because they had a keen sense of social obligation. They gave themselves to reform movements such as anti-slavery, prison reform, and the fight for women's rights, and they were distressed by the unwillingness of the Unitarian churches to bend in these directions and act as a movement.

Here, then, were the two major elements within the Unitarian faith: the orthodox and the progressive. Did they act like good liberals and dwell together in peace, seek the truth in freedom, and help one another in brotherly love? They did not! As soon as the Civil War was over, the Unitarians started one of their own. The rising resentment of the conservatives against the radicals took definite form. Many leading Unitarians were tired of being challenged and bothered by these radicals with their Transcendentalist ideas, their comparative religion and their Biblical criticisms. There had long been discussions and arguments between them about this business of being Christians: Unitarian orthodoxy claimed that it was necessary to be a Christian in order to be a Unitarian, and the progressives challenged this, saying that it was entirely a matter of personal choice whether a Unitarian wanted to call himself a Christian or not, and that free religion could

not properly limit itself to any form of supernatural revelation.

The controversy came to a head when a convention was called in New York in 1865, to which all Unitarians were invited, to come dropping their disagreements for a time and concerning themselves with the positive gospel of their faith. But though orthodox and radicals responded warmly to the call, it appears that the master minds behind the conference had something else in mind. Their objective was to steer the convention into adopting a creed which would become a means of clearing out the radicals who surely would not accept it. Underlying this surface disagreement about being or not being Christians, there was, of course, a more fundamental issue: It was whether Unitarians should have anything to do with social reform, and it was the plan of the orthodox group to answer this question by putting across a creed that would be acceptable to the wealthy and influential members of their churches. After a lively session their move met with success, and the desired conservative creedal position was adopted by a sizable majority. And when another convention met the next year and upheld this action, after a hot battle with tempers flaring, a group of progressive Unitarians saw the handwriting on the wall and decided that the time had come to act on behalf of a genuinely free religion.

The implication of their church's action was, as they saw it, that they were not wanted, that they were too radical for it; and they saw their opportunity to found a religious movement that would be really free and inclusive of all who were interested in pure and free religion and in humanitarian reform. The result was the Free Religious Association, founded in 1867, dedicated to "encourage the scientific study of religion and ethics, to advocate freedom in religion, to increase fellowship in the spirit, and to emphasize the supremacy of practical morality in all the relations of life." It invited all persons sympathizing with these aims into its membership. Among its founders were Unitarians, Ethical Culturists, Universalists, Spiritualists, Jews, and Quakers. The story of the F.R.A. cannot be told here, but the point for us is that here was an attempt at a genuinely free religious association. It was small, and crippled by divisions from the start, but nevertheless it was able to exercise in its half-century of life a profound and telling influence on orthodox Christianity and especially upon Unitarianism. It sought to emancipate religion entirely from irrational and traditional authority, but no home could be found for that sort of religion in any existing religious body of that day, not even the Unitarian, so it organized independently and called upon all who were dissatisfied with the situations in their own denominations.

From the beginning to the end, the story of the F.R.A. reveals that certain inherent weaknesses prevented it from becoming what its noble ideals deserved—a vast and successful religious movement sweeping the country. In the main, its members were so insistent on their freedom that it was almost impossible for them to organize in any kind of concerted action. As a result, the Association was limited pretty definitely to religious propaganda, though many of its individual members became outstanding in the social reforms of the day. But in spite of its weaknesses, this vigorous little movement, born of the intolerance of a liberal church that was not liberal enough, did some rather remarkable things. For a half-century, due to the inspiration of this free religious movement, the voice of free religion was heard wherever religious leaders gathered, and it was the challenging voice of those, mostly Unitarians, who believed that a concern for the ennoblement of human life was paramount as the concern of religion, above all other considerations of creed, doctrine, or ritual. It not only gave but insisted upon complete freedom of religious belief among those who were devoted to its broad and humane goals, and thus it was able to act as a constant stimulus, a religious irritant, and a reminder of broader horizons whenever men of religion got together. It was a definite influence in the liberalizing of Protestant Christianity in America in the last half of the nineteenth century.

But more specifically, it exerted its most profound effect upon Unitarianism. Rising directly out of a situation where a supposedly free church was erecting fences and shutting out those whom it felt were too liberal, the Free Religious Association actually became a telling and decisive influence upon that very church in breaking down the intolerance of the more orthodox Unitarians. It really jarred the Unitarians, and ended by actually bringing the whole movement around to a much more tolerant and inclusive point of view. What happened was that this small but vocal crusade by Liberal Unitarians on behalf of a completely free religion put into motion forces which resulted in a few decades in Unitarianism abandoning its mistaken position of requiring a confession of belief in a certain view of Jesus' Lordship and a certain kind of God. By the turn of the twentieth century, Unitarianism had dissolved these old religious boundaries so far that it was able to include both Humanist and theist, both conservative and radical liberalism. When the thoroughgoing liberals organized themselves in protest against being shut out by the orthodox, they put the Unitarian movement on the defensive and embarrassed it by showing up its rather complacent claim to being the most liberal of churches. Never once since that time has any similar effort been successful to limit the Unitarian faith to one kind of liberal belief. There have been from time to time sporadic movements started to put Unitarian religion into a labelled bottle that would exclude those ideas which conservatives thought were too extreme, but never since the experience with the F.R.A. has such an effort even come close to succeeding.

Dr. Persons has done us all a real service in bringing to our attention this little known story of our liberal past. The most needed result of his research will be, I hope, to persuade us, beyond a possibility of a doubt, of the futility and folly of being exclusive in religion, of trying to put the religious impulses in the heart of man into the straitjacket of a creedal system. The whole story of religion in human experience bears witness to the stupidity of such narrowness. Times out of number have religions built fences, forced out the heretics and rebels and progressives from their midst, and then found that the very thing they tried to silence has won the victory and ended by conquering them! It is perhaps a shock to learn that our own liberal faith has been guilty of the same folly in the past, that we too have succumbed at times to the temptation of drawing lines between those who are to be tolerated and those who are not. It is therefore of the utmost importance for us to see how, in this unfortu-

nate instance of Unitarian intolerance, the old, old lesson of history repeats itself. The orthodox among us think we are killing off the radicals, but we are only paving the way for the triumph of their ideas, for ideas can *never* be killed off, especially when they are in the line of progress.

This story may seem distant and past to us now, and so it is; we may think that such a thing can never happen in our free fellowship again. But it can if we allow it to! At this very moment there are two movements under way to limit our hard-won Unitarian freedom of spirit. They have taken to themselves the high-sounding names of "The Unitarian Christian Committee" and "The National Committee of Free Unitarians." The one seems to be trying to turn back the Unitarian clock to the orthodoxy of 1865, and apparently would have Unitarian fellowship limited to those liberals who happen to believe in God and consider themselves Christians. And the other is seeking to force Unitarian ministers to confine their attention to what the Committee calls "spiritual" things, and is especially anxious to discourage any concern with social, economic, or world problems by the Unitarian churches and their leaders.

Now let us be crystal clear in our minds on this: There is a welcome place in our free fellowship for those who interpret liberal religion along the lines of its more conservative traditions. The theistic tradition of belief in a personal God, the Christian tradition, and the tradition of spiritual, mystical religion have always been honored and necessary parts of the Unitarian heritage. But a truer thing is this, that there is more to Unitarian religion than a past tradition; there is the forward urge to new and unexplored horizons, and this urge is being served today by many of those who are being labelled Humanists, Naturalists, and Secularists, and those who feel that religion has social and world responsibilities. There is a place in our Unitarian fellowship for many varieties of belief, but the *one* thing there is *no* place for in our free church is intolerance, the narrow spirit that would say: These and only these believers are true liberals; here we stand and we will go no further; this we believe and this we will never depart from.

If we are distressed by the unorthodoxy of some in our midst, by their departure from some of the old landmarks of Unitarian belief long familiar to us, or by their sometimes aggressive concern for controversial social issues, then surely what we now know about our own history should persuade us that tightening and narrowing the boundaries of our belief is no way to meet these challenges. The American way, the Unitarian way, the liberal way, is to dwell together in peace and to seek the truth by the free interplay of freely held and freely expressed convictions, in the deep faith that what is true and good will survive, if it has truth and good in it. We of the free church are committed beyond recall to the faith that truth must grow, and that it can grow *only* in an atmosphere of free thought, free exchange, and free experimentation, for we are convinced, or should be by now, that a truth or belief established by any other means is built on shifting sands and carries the seeds of its own destruction within it.

Behind the controversies that periodically arise to threaten our unity, there lurks a feeling which we should acknowledge and encourage more than we do, a feeling that something new and better and more universally human is in the making among us. In our quieter moments we recall that the radicals and outcasts of one generation usually become the honored and statued heroes of the next. This has always been true in human affairs generally, and so it is in religion. Let there be at least one church, then, one fellowship of religious men and women, that welcomes the growing pains that change and progress bring, one church that looks upon the heretic in its midst as possibly the prophet of things yet to come that are not yet fully understood, one church that insists upon maintaining at all times a free and warm comradeship in its very midst between the excellence of things that are past and the promise of new truth yet to be discovered! Let that church be frankly and democratically a part of the world it lives in, sharing in its traditions, its best thinking, and its broadest vision of the good life for all men, and let that church provide for men and women of intelligence and good will an ever-present opportunity to work together for that great and good end, bringing to it freely all of their varied convictions and beliefs, whatever they may be, so long as their ultimate and practical devotion is to the betterment and enrichment of our common human life.

Preparation for Parenthood

ETHEL S. BEER

Parenthood is a blessing but also a burden. It involves much more than the physical tie. No matter how much is delegated to others, the parents are responsible for their children's bringing-up. In fact, this bringing-up constitutes the strongest bond between parents and children, as is evidenced in cases of adoption.

Animal parents are more fortunate than human parents because they instinctively know how to rear their young. But children are very different from small animals. They require special knowledge which must be learned. Child care is not an intuitive process.

Doubtless the majority of parents have excellent intentions. They are conscientious individuals, deeply devoted to their children. The emotional attachment starts as soon as the baby is born. Immediately in the squirming mite, the parents see a definite personality. Their love is stirred and this love is almost impossible to quench. Therefore it is absurd to blame their mistakes on a lack of feeling. Often they have too much. Not that this is necessarily a handicap. Only it is not enough.

How can human beings be so careless when confronted with the hardest task on earth—the bringing up of children? Should they, our most precious heritage, be entrusted to those who have no previous preparation? Is it fair to consider parenthood a casual undertaking instead of an important career? Children need the help of their elders. Despite the proverbial Topsy

they do not just grow.

Parents cannot rely on an imaginary instinctive equipment. "Mother knows best," and "Father is always right" are outworn phrases today. The modern world has made great strides in education. Parents must not lag behind. To keep abreast of the times they too must learn their job. Nor should they wait until after the first baby is born. This is what happens all too frequently. Baby's welcome includes material things, but rarely are the father and mother prepared to look after this new member of their household.

In justice to parents it must be said that they often recognize their limitations and study child care after the arrival of the baby. Parent education has invaded every class. But it starts too late because once parenthood is reached, there is likely to be super-sensitiveness. Besides parents generally seek light on their own problems instead of learning the general principles of child care. They want sympathy for their hard lot rather than knowledge about the bringing-up of children. Hence they are likely to regard any suggestion as unkind criticism. Defensively, parents will say: "You don't know *my* child," or "You haven't lived with a youngster twenty-four hours a day, year in and year out."

But granted these statements are true, the obvious flaw in such reasoning is that because of their closeness to the situation, parents do not always have perspective. It is much easier to be objective about other people's problems than our own. And even though we ourselves could not do any better, we still can see what is wrong and how to remedy it. Human knowledge would increase at a very slow rate if we could learn only from personal experience. It is unintelligent to claim that an individual cannot know how to bring up a child without first having one. If the world concurs in this belief children will suffer indefinitely.

The point is that to handle children properly, training is of the utmost importance. Ordinarily, parents demand this of outsiders who care for their children. The nurse or governess whom they engage has had some preparation. The schools chosen have professional teachers; the doctors and dentists, recognized degrees. Why, then, do parents consider themselves exceptions?

Perhaps the fault lies in the frequently accepted idea about the position of children. To a great extent they are still deemed the property of their parents. The soundness of family life cannot be denied. Children thrive in such an environment. But the home cannot be glorified without rhyme or reason. Parents are no more sacrosanct than anybody else. In fact with so much talk nowadays about the disruption of the family, it behooves parents to look to their laurels. They are the guardians of future citizens and should be fit custodians.

Is it too much to ask that parents prepare themselves, as professionals do? Artists, authors, and even craftsmen do not depend entirely on their talent or skill, no matter how great. Their apprenticeship teaches them the value of an objective viewpoint. As a result, the majority welcome criticism even after they are established in their careers. Probably parents would, too, if they studied about child care before having children. Therefore, this should be a part of general education for boys and girls alike.

Training for parenthood cannot start too early. Few children grow up without watching some younger relative from time to time. If they are not too immature for this, they can also learn the proper technique. Beginning with the simplest precepts, boys and girls can be taught gradually until child care is a familiar subject. But the responsibility for such study should not be left to the parents or there will be too great a variety of standards. What is needed is a crystallization of the knowledge of experts presented impersonally. Schools and colleges should give such instruction in their regular curriculum. Only, the program must be flexible as well as adaptable to various age groups.

Starting informally in the primary grades, the rudiments of handling children should be instilled without undue emphasis. But before the child leaves grammar school there should be a more definite approach so that the importance of this subject is realized. In High School the scope can be broadened considerably. Boys and girls in their teens will be stimulated by the new discoveries of medicine which change the principles of child care from time to time. Also, a certain amount can be applied to their own bringing-up as well as to that of other children they know. In college, child care should be obligatory, too, for both sexes. If possible the theoretical knowledge should be accompanied by practical experience. Always the primary purpose should be to awaken youth's conscience to the responsibility of preparing for parenthood. In the long run this should make for more competent and thoughtful parents.

Needless to say, the result of such a program would reach far beyond the nursery walls. The importance of training children cannot be overemphasized. Upon their slender shoulders rests the future of the world. Their immature bodies carry the seeds of unborn generations. Therefore, their fate as adults is of great significance to civilization.

Instead of thinking of parents, then, in the narrow compass of their own homes, they must be identified with the broader scope of world betterment. The real hope for the improvement of mankind lies in this long-sighted policy. For this reason the spotlight must be turned on the generation growing up. That is, by starting to teach the children of today, a foundation will be laid for the bringing-up of the children of tomorrow. In a word, to realize its potentiality, parent education must be primarily preparation for parenthood.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page 2*)

gregation on the basic theme of good will and better understanding. They should be sent to: *The Churchman,* 425 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.

Among those who have read the sermons over the air are: Herbert Lehman, Eric Johnston, Warren Austin, Harold Ickes, Paul Muni, John Garfield, Henry J. Kaiser, William Shirer, Harold Stassen, Senator Raymond Baldwin, Carl Carmer, Fredric March, Walter White, Margaret Webster, Chester Bowles, Norman Corwin, Senator Claude Pepper, Dr. Robert Millikan, Dr. Harry Overstreet, William O'Dwyer, Norman Cousins, Bennett Cerf, and Harrison Smith.

Spinoza's Influence on Philosophy, Religion, and Daily Life

LEONARD B. GRAY

Surely Emerson was right when he said that time does strange things with the reputations of men. Indeed, time often withholds fame from those who seek it most and gives it to those who seek it least. She immerses into oblivion many people sensationally popular and widely praised in their own days and clothes with immortality some of the little known or despised contemporaries of these popular persons. You just cannot tell what time will do, what values and names she will forget or belittle, and what she will love and praise and preserve.

If they could know, many of the contemporaries of Spinoza would be greatly surprised at the judgment time has passed on him. They knew that this philosopher was one of the most despised and hated men of his day, and some of them knew that quite early in his life fame was one of the three values he thought unworthy of his seeking and that along with the other two he deliberately chose not to seek it. Not only would most of his contemporaries that knew him be amazed at his fame that now fills the world, but also his enemies would be angrily humiliated and shamed either by their own oblivion or by the fact that they are known today only because they were his enemies.

With the possible exception of Thoreau's few pages on "What I Lived For" in *Walden,* literature contains no finer description of a man's sincere effort to find the simple fundamentals of life and happiness than Spinoza's few pages about his own search for the essential values. Indeed, the young Spinoza strove just as earnestly to get at the root of the matter as Thoreau, about two centuries later, sought to live deliberately, to front only the essential facts of life, to live deep and suck out all the marrow of life, to skin life to the bone, and to drive life into a corner so he could get his two hands on it. Early in life this Jewish philosopher carefully weighed the values of riches, fame, and pleasures of the senses, the three surroundings of life, according to his observation, most highly esteemed by most men. He soon found these surroundings, he tells us, to be vain and futile. With what passionate thirsts and with what disastrous consequences men seek these three values. Men let their minds become so absorbed by these goals of their desires that their minds have little power to reflect on any different good. When the heat of sensual delight has passed, it not infrequently leaves one in extreme melancholy. The best intellectual powers, never enthralled by such delights, are only disturbed and dulled. The more fame and riches we get, the more they increase our delight and the more they intensify our desire to acquire still more and more. Should we fail to gain them we are plunged into feelings of frustration and sadness. The search for fame has the further drawback of putting upon us the necessity of ordering our lives according to the lives of our fellow men, of shunning what they shun, and of seeking what they seek. Such values are nothing but hindrances to essential living and real happiness. Men have been known to suffer persecution, at times even unto death, in search for riches and fame. Others hasten their death through over-indulgence in sensual pleasures. To possess these values, and especially to be possessed by them, means death, often physical, always spiritual. The more this earnest young Jew weighed these values, the more he became convinced that they were unworthy of his seeking and that only love toward a thing eternal and infinite could feed the mind wholly with joy and give genuine happiness. And so he set his goal before him and directed his aim. During his short life he did not get the three values he did not want, but through the earnest and continual seeking of the one value he wanted and decided upon, he attained a large measure of happiness despite the persecutions heaped upon him. And posterity with her strange ways and judgments, gave him fame, one of the three values he had deliberately chosen not to seek. In 1882, Ernest Renan, unveiling a statue of Spinoza at the Hague, a monument that has become a symbolic reminder of many monuments of love and praise to our philosopher throughout the world, concluded his address with these words:

> Woe to him who in passing should hurl an insult at this gentle and pensive head. He would be punished, as all vulgar souls are punished, by his very vulgarity, and by his incapacity to conceive what is divine. This man, from his granite pedestal, will point out to all men the way of blessedness which he found; and ages hence, the cultivated traveller, passing by this spot, will say in his heart, "The truest vision ever had of God came, perhaps, here."

Not only through his reading of history, but also through his own bitter, personal experience Baruch de Spinoza was to learn that both organized religion and society whip their dissenters. On November 24, 1632, he was born into the Jewish community of Amsterdam to which his Jewish parents had fled from the vicious intolerance of the inquisition. There was more freedom of thought and worship in Holland at the time than elsewhere, but even there, while allowed to build their synagogue, the Jews had to exercise their freedom with considerable circumspection. Partly because the minority group greatly feared the political authorities who punished the whole group for the offense of any individual member and partly because the religious leaders of this Jewish community would not give to those under them the same freedom that they wanted for themselves, young Spinoza was excommunicated for his independent thinking. At fifteen the boy was the most brilliant student of Rabbi Saul Levi Mortiera. He was the pride and white hope of the little community of Jews. He would be, his elders predicted, a great rabbi, perhaps a great commentator on the Bible. But at an early age this acute rabbinical student began to dampen the hopes and to incite the fears of the orthodox. His conventional teachers could not clip the wings of his soaring mind. Their learning was insufficient and unsatisfactory to him. He acquired an appetite for science and secular philosophy. Freely he inhaled the free Latin culture around him. Increasingly his thinking became critical and independent. Stronger grew his dislike for the narrow and rigid rules of the synagogue, stronger his revolt against all forms of dualism and idolatry. In vain the alarmed and disappointed leaders sought to keep the new wine in the old bottles. Matters were gradually coming to a head and did come to a head when some of Spinoza's fellow students angrily

left a heated argument and reported to their teachers that Spinoza sharply differed with them about the existence of angels, the incorporeality of God, and the immortality of the soul. The authorities wanted to keep their most promising student, but they would keep him only on their conditions. And they had only two more methods in mind to induce him to return to established opinions and customs. First, a bribe of an annuity of 1,000 florins. But truth was the greatest wealth to the youth. Then the threat of excommunication if the student did not yield after thirty days. Spinoza did not yield. Of the excommunication couched in the cruelest denunciation we have ever read, this young man of twenty-four said, "It compels me to do nothing which I should not have done in any case."

And then quickly as possible this religious outcast wrote a spirited and unyielding reply to the authorities, renounced his traditional religion, and let it be known that he no longer wanted to be called "Baruch," his Jewish name, but rather "Benedictus," the Latin equivalent. Henceforth then for Benedictus Spinoza, despite the continuing denunciations heaped upon him, a free and contented life of study in retirement, with a few devoted friends and disciples about him, moving from one obscure village to another, until his settlement in the Hague in 1671 where he lived until his death in 1677.

The chief way that Spinoza chose to make a living did much to bring about his early death at the age of forty-five. He loved to teach children and he loved to write, but he could not expect to make much money in these ways. He could get only a few pupils and his writing was too thoughtful to make popular appeal. Besides, the hands of conventional religion and public opinion were too much against him. Why not make a livelihood at polishing lenses? Was not this quite the fashion of learned men of his day? And did not the young student find in "Ethics of the Fathers" the advice that every man should do some manual labor? He did his lenses exceptionally well and thereby earned enough to supply his few and simple needs. Wisdom was the goal of his supreme efforts. Concentrated on severe study he would often stay in his room two or three days at a stretch and have his meals brought to him. But what price wisdom? The many hours of confined study in his lonely garret and the dust from the grinding greatly aggravated his inherited tuberculosis and so did much to cut him off prematurely.

Yet please do not think from his profound learning and from his shrinking from public gaze that our scholar had the spirit of an unhuman, ascetic recluse. There was nothing narrow or musty about him. Visitors were surprised in looking at his library to see more books of literature than of science and philosophy. They learned that often he found delight in coming down of an evening to smoke a pipe with his host and hostess and to talk their simple language. And this learned man would urge his guests to indulge moderately in pleasant food and drink, dress and perfumes, sports and music and theatrical shows as a splendid way of refreshing and recreating themselves.

It must be that men can hate unorthodox views to a great intensity, for what other reason could there be for so many of his contemporaries hating and hounding this personally affectionate, lovable, and attractive man? This middle-sized man was good to look at with his fine features, dark skin, black eyebrows, black and curly hair, typical of the Portuguese Jews. Unless previously prejudiced against him, visitors were instinctively drawn to this modest, unassuming, evenly-tempered, kindly man with his courteous and gentle manners. People were especially attracted by his extraordinary black eyes in which shone both brilliance and kindliness. Indeed, not a few persons loved and honored this great and lovable man. In his obscure lodgings he was a powerful magnet that drew visits and letters, honors and gifts from the great. The philosopher Leibnitz came to talk with him in 1676. There is much friendship and learning in the letters that he and Henry Oldenburg, the first secretary of the Royal Society of England, wrote each other. University students sought him out at Rhijinsburg and went back to tell their fellows that they had found a man who understood Descartes better than their professors. Heidelberg tried its best to get him into its chair of philosophy. We are sorry he refused, but appreciate his reason, namely, his honest wish to be free to think and write in his own way. Several wealthy men, including the grand monarch of the Dutch Republic, tried in vain to give him large gifts of money and annuities. And we are glad to add that not a few of his neighbors fondly regarded him like the neighborhood barber who, shortly after our philosopher's death, sent in his little bill referring to "Mr. Spinoza, of blessed memory."

You only have to bear in mind orthodoxy's habitual opposition to everything opposed to its entrenched views and consider how sharply Spinoza differed with the dominant religious views of his day to understand the bitter persecution that fell upon this Jewish philosopher. Here was a thinker challenging the anthropomorphic views of God around him. Why, asked Spinoza, will men identify God with a magnified man? Why will they insist in making God in their own image? Why should God be like man at all? God is nature, the questioner went on to claim, and by nature he meant not only infinite matter and infinite thought but also many other infinite attributes. God is not the transient, but the indwelling cause of all things, and no substance can be granted or conceived outside of Him. Whatever is, is in God. Only by the laws of His own nature God acts.

Nature is an absolutely infinite, unified, and uniform order. By the necessity of the divine nature all things are conditioned to exist and operate in a particular manner. Therefore all things are necessarily determined by nature. There is no absolute or free will, not even in the mind, for the mind is determined to wish this or that by a cause which has also been determined by another cause and this last by still another cause and so on to infinity. Man's fate is not absolutely in his own hands, for he must follow the common order of nature and obey it and accommodate himself to it. Wrote Spinoza in his *Ethics,* "Men think themselves free because they are conscious of their volitions and desires, but they are ignorant of the causes by which they are led to wish and desire."

In a flawlessly operating universe, this believer in the immutable order of things claimed, there can be no such things as miracles. The masses and the theologians of his day thought that miracles exhibit the power of God. In all ages, including the present, many people with this same belief can have no adequate religion as far as they are concerned without miracles. But really, Spinoza said, miracles, if they occurred, would exhibit not the power but rather the impotence

of God. Not by temperamental interruptions in the course of events but rather by immutable and necessary laws is the omnipotence of the one absolutely infinite Being manifested. By making organized knowledge and rational control impossible, miracles would make rational life impossible. Science and a commensurate power of scientific control are possible because all things are determined neither by miracle nor chance but by necessity.

Think of man, this philosopher urged, not as an *imperium in imperio,* not as a little complete world within the larger universe, but only as a part of the whole universe. Man is caught up and carried along by the whole eternal order of nature, of which he is only a small part, even as a little worm in the blood may be swept along by the sweeping currents of life of which it can itself have only an imperfect conception. We are thinking now of people who have lost their religious faith in calamity because such faith as they had was mistakenly built on the premise that God and the universe exist for their welfare. And likely most of you can recall that during the last war not a few people, even though they knew that many of their fellow men were being drowned and shot in other places, claimed that they themselves or some other sailors and soldiers were delivered from death by God directing clouds and schools of fish to the rafts upon which they were drifting far out at sea. Such people need to realize Spinoza's claim that the universal laws by which the cosmos as a whole is controlled have a wider compass than the welfare or misery of an individual life or even of mankind.

Wisdom comes from this realization, our philosopher said, wisdom and a tolerant acceptance of and a compassion toward human perversity. Vices as well as virtues are the necessary outcome of nature's power. And there is support and help for man in living according to reason, in the understanding of and the adaptation to the necessary and immutable order of nature. This is what it means to know and to obey God. The *summum bonum* of the mind is to know God. And blessedness, a favorite word with Spinoza, is simply that very peace of soul which springs from an intuitive knowledge of God. Peace of mind and true greatness come from ruling one's self, from standing above the partialities and futilities of uninformed desire rather than from ruling others and raising one's self above humanity. This sort of living is a nobler freedom than that which men call free will.

I find it difficult to go all the way with Spinoza, perhaps at times more from personal preference and wish-thinking than from honest facing of facts. But it does seem that he is not always consistent. He frequently sent sharp bolts of criticism against organizations that promoted superstition. He was pained to the depths of his being, as I am to the depths of mine, by those who profess the Christian religion while they quarrel with intense bitterness. Yet at other times he urged us not to blame people for their perversities which are caused, he claimed, even as their best characteristics are, by the necessities of the eternal order and of their life-situations. And how, I ask, could Spinoza place moral responsibility upon men while he claimed that their desires and deeds are caused by forces outside the possibility of their knowledge and control? Surely this great rationalist was right in urging men to live by reason rather than by uncoordinated passions. And we commend this man who was always so loving and gentle himself for urging all men to live with justice, tolerance, and love, and never to avenge wrongs done against them. Yet how can men live only by reason and the best impulses if their mental processes and feelings are put into them entirely without their knowledge or sanction?

With Hegel we are inclined to feel that Spinoza's system is too lifeless and rigid. His system is so rigorously ironclad that it seems to remove individual and group initiatives, creative thought and action, and spontaneous fertility. It seems to refute the Christian teaching of human dignity and worth and the Christian claim that men can rise on their dead or degenerate selves to greater beings. The best within us revolts against this. We stubbornly cling to the doctrine of the divine worth of man. We dislike to think that the twenty-third psalm, the Sermon on the Mount, Wordsworth's "Lines Composed a Few Miles above Tintern Abbey," and Whitman's "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd" came into existence from the necessities of the eternal order and not from the altogether original and fresh geniuses and creative powers of their authors. We dislike to think that Spinoza's own decision to seek eternal truth instead of the three values he rejected and his decision to grind lenses for a living, a decision that probably meant his early death, came not from his own free power of choice but rather from a series of causes of which he himself was unaware and which he could not control. We prefer to think, as Walt Whitman surely thought, that within the areas of our limitations there is a "spontaneous you" in you and a "spontaneous me" in me. We prefer to agree with Will Durant in his claim that man is a creature composed of heredity and environment plus a strange, progressive, remolding force which we call life and that this life-force can take the initiative for a new and better character. Against Spinoza's rejection of any cosmic purpose we prefer to side with Plato and Aristotle and with Lecomte du Nouy in his *Human Destiny* in their claims that throughout history the evolution of the universe and the evolution of man, biologically and spiritually, move with perfect purpose. Of course our philosopher would say that the immutable order of the universe is altogether indifferent to our personal preferences, and we suppose that this is so. And yet the Christian doctrine of the worth of man and the Christian claim that there are spiritual powers that man can call upon and use for great endeavors support those philosophers who claim that when life is creative it gives a measure of freedom to the will.

Yet even though we cannot go all the way with Spinoza, still we cannot deny that he is right to a large extent and that there are great values in his teachings. With him we must acknowledge that we understand nature only imperfectly and that she is not held together by laws enacted by human reason. Surely it is obvious that the universe does not exist for the sake of any one of us or for the sake of the race as a whole, and that often she destroys our most cherished hopes and best laid plans. Not only are we all limited and restricted by political and economic and social conditions, by our associates, by our physical health and strength, and by weather and climate, but also by our innate abilities and by our inexplainable dispositions and tendencies. Through the very nature of things we all fail to get many things we wish and seek. Do not all of us know people who are held in certain, ordinary

occupations and stations in life and other people who climb into better occupations and stations in life, more by the abilities and personality-traits given to them than by anything else? Do not all of us know people who have certain tastes and interests, hold certain views, follow certain courses of action, become missionaries or ministers or reformers or writers or scientists, because, it seems, they can hardly help themselves against certain inexplainable drives and compulsions within them? It does seem that to a large degree, if not to the same degree that Spinoza claimed, men have certain necessities laid upon them by the nature of the universe of which man is a part, and that their lives are determined by causes unknown to them and uncontrolled by them.

And surely we are helped to acquire sensible and healthy attitudes towards "the heavy and the weary weight of all this unintelligible world" by our philosopher's claim that belief in determinism serves to fortify us to expect and to bear both faces of fortune with an equal mind and a contented heart. Such a belief does help us to accept the laws of nature and our limitations without complaint, and at the same time moves us to make the best of our lives within the areas of the limitations placed upon us. Such a belief teaches us that God is no capricious personality absorbed in the private affairs of His devotees, but rather the invariable sustaining order of the universe. To know God as such an eternal order of nature helps us to adapt ourselves to what is unchangeable, and to find through this adaptation support and confidence, and contentment and happiness of spirit which is true blessedness, Spinoza said.

Increasingly since his day, Spinoza's teachings have become an intimate part of philosophy, of religion, and of the daily thinking and living of men. This Jewish philosopher has made his strongest appeal to the great philosophical poets such as Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Goethe.

From Spinoza, Goethe learned that we must bear the limitations that nature places upon us. From breathing the calm air of this serene and happy philosopher, Germany's greatest poet was influenced to no small degree to rid himself of the wild romanticism of his early poems such as "Gotz" and "Werther" and to acquire the classic poise of his later life and writing.

There is still another encouragement to be found in Spinoza's determinism, an encouragement to live with the positive virtues of love, justice, and active usefulness. Our philosopher was positive when he claimed that everything in the universe that enlarges and enriches life as well as that which limits and confines us, is God. George Eliot who was greatly influenced by Spinoza, made Adam Bede express this belief in these words, "For what have we got, either inside or outside of us, but what comes from God? If we've got a resolution to do right, He gave it us, I reckon, first or last."

Such a positive philosophy then, such a healthy belief in a determinism supplies us, as it supplied Spinoza and Goethe, with positive virtues, and motivates positive living on our part by prompting us to believe that our best impulses are God-given and authentic.

Wings on His Casket

HAROLD P. MARLEY

A man was laid away in the ground on February 2nd who belonged up above in the clouds. His hearse was not really on wheels, escorted by eight motorcyles—it was hitched to a star. His casket was not this bronze receptacle which men labored to carry through the snow, but that P-80 streaking across the cemetery sky.

Orville Wright, the unpretentious man who shunned interviews, and told Hollywood that it could film the story of the Wright brothers only over his dead body, now lies beside his brother. Wilbur's death in 1912, hastened by his anxiety over patent litigation, has some parallel to the long and bitter struggle waged by Orville with the Smithsonian Institute over the false credit it gave to Samuel P. Langley as the first man to fly a craft heavier than air.

Now they sleep quietly, exonerated, honored by plane-loads of dignitaries who came from everywhere. These brothers, who would never risk a simultaneous death, and religiously abstained from ever flying together, their hazardous labor done, now rest in the ground they victoriously defied.

The minister tried hard to keep a service, which listed fifty honorary pallbearers, simple. He began with a simple man, George Washington Carver who credited his chemurgy wonders to the Great Chemist in the sky. He spoke of the importance of character and the character of greatness, so well demonstrated by the typical Midwestern boy who turned from the bicycle business to a machine which would fly. As the score of uniformed men wearing wing insignia listened, he quoted the brothers as to the importance of using their invention for purposes of peace—a peace which Orville lived to see exiled for six long years, and now again jeopardized by what he called a "cat and dog fight." He told of the father of Wilbur and Orville, a minister in the United Brethren Church, editor of the denominational paper published at headquarters in Dayton. He wanted his boys to go into the ministry, but in giving them a toy helicopter he conditioned them more to mechanics than to reading the wonders of the Bible, for which he was never sorry.

When the casket, draped with red roses, moved up the aisle, Daytonians shed a tear for a man they regarded more as a neighbor than as one of a team of heroes who had lined up the bored royalty of Europe for a free ride. They recalled the experiments with kites in a river park, and the propeller tests from a boat on Wolfe Creek. Kitty Hawk was too far away to be visualized—it is the name of a hotel bar. They remembered riding out on special flat cars on the interurban to the pasture three miles east of town to see a "flying machine" which worked, and the time when Henry Ford carted away the old bicycle shop and the Wright home to Greenfield Village. But the thing they most remember is the time when the two boys returned home from Europe—that was a celebration which moved the town as much as the

famous flood of 1913.

Newspapers, which refused even a line on the occasion of the first flight, printed all the little anecdotes they could unearth. They speculated upon the return of the original plane from England to America. They even hoped it might come to Dayton and rest in the old Court House on whose steps Lincoln once spoke.

So Dayton glances into the sky at the many experimental planes which zoom about the army's Wright Field east of the city. The suburb on the southern hills, Oakwood, will find another member for its library board. Someone will write a biography about the man who did not want to talk or be talked about. The two lads on motor-scooters who waited respectfully near the funeral procession will keep their vigil with mechanics—perhaps to be the Wright brothers of tomorrow.

Orville Wright was "grounded" on February 2nd, but his spirit went soaring that day on swift unflapping wings overhead. His past belongs to the ages, but his future is locked within those serious-faced men of science and in the hearts of the neighbors who turned sorrowfully away from his grave.

Faces Are Peculiar

MANFRED A. CARTER

A caricaturist sees strangers by their eccentricities. A portrait painter walks around his model to discover variations from the typical classic face. He talks with his sitter to discover that inner difference between one person and others. Someone has condensed many a dry volume of theology into the statement that "a Christian goes through the world seeing faces instead of things."

The two sides of a face do not match and no two faces are alike. While noses are hereditary, the expression lines are our personal responsibility. These lines grow more expressive with the years. Faces are peculiar and Webster defines that word as, "belonging to an individual, not common." In the day of "we psychology," total state government, and ecclesiastical conformity it may not be out of place to rejoice that there are egotistical Christians. Some of them are only cranks and some of them create the new world, but both types are symbolical of the fact that religion is a personal as well as a social affair. If we are to love our neighbors as ourselves we must first respect ourselves—our opinions, our experiences, and our personal beliefs.

We have talked much of sacrifice, little of what sacrifice is for. Sinclair Lewis has a character say, "Love must stop somewhere short of suicide." On the other hand, some may avoid individualism through tolerance in its extreme form of laziness. I recall a scene in Boston after a hurricane. Forty or fifty men were sitting among the fallen trees playing checkers. Nobody thought to give them axes. Perhaps they would not have used them. Certainly that is not the way our forefathers would have reacted to a hurricane. Many people are sitting and doing the equivalent of playing checkers in the hurricane that is upon us now. Either through a distortion of the meaning of sacrifice, or through an overdose of tolerance, we are losing the power of the single mind.

Every minister has amusing memories of conceited Christians who would not play with the team. I recall an old man with dark whiskers who rose up in the morning worship and cried with a loud voice, "I believe we need hymn books more than moving pictures in this church, and here's five dollars for hymn books." I took his five dollars, gratefully, and I respected and remembered his independence. We still had the moving pictures!

Every liberal minister bumps painfully against a few people who worship in an older way. It seems to me that he should respect them, for they are usually earnest and sincere. Most of these people are self-starters in religion and do not need to be programmed into things. Admittedly, some of them are neurotics, taking out their personal unhappiness in religious fanaticism. Even so, we might remember that many of the world's great ones were once called crazy. I recall a priest who said he did not have much use for saints because he had to live with one during his training years. Great saints are sometimes like artists with temperament. Some Christian egotists have eccentricity without much balancing value for the world, but they are a corrective to the sinister menace of our day—the mass mind.

Socialism, in one form or another, is sweeping over the world like an overwhelming tide. We needed it to wash away the accumulated filth of our inhuman economy but there is some danger that the baby may be swept out to sea with the bath. Of what use for Socialism to gain the whole world if the individual man is lost? Man is more than an eater of bread. The wise capitalist and the wise socialist will cling to the sacredness of individualism, will see faces instead of systems.

The determinism of Freudian and behavioristic psychology, the bathtub vision of materialistic sociology, and the dominance of the Jones family all try to kill individualism. The church has not remained free from the undermining currents of the dominant thought of our day. If man is only an unhappy accident of his environment then, of course, the environment is the thing to change. But if Borden P. Bowne is right, that "personality is the key to reality," then we should seek religious persons even more than religious environment. Our ethics are schizophrenic because the individual does not test them against facts and common sense. We bow down too quickly to styles of thought. Back of the face is the soul of man, but science has been out to kill the soul. It has only recently repented. The face of pure, disvalued science has a robot monotony.

Of course the invention of atomic energy was a great thing, the product of impersonal science. It might even be used as the weapon of abstract justice. But if atom bombs play around enough there will not be any people. Science has now discovered that people are necessary after all! A fragment of the soul of man seems to be in process of destroying the whole soul, including itself. Unless our lazy minds begin to see faces instead of systems, here and abroad, there will be nothing left but dust blowing idly in a cloud. After all this is our earth, even if it is only a minor planet. Now the scientists are beginning to see faces again.

Our educational product has been "a disintegrated, frustrated, materialistic, aggressive, and warlike crea-

ture." We have taught men how to make a living, and stimulated curiosity, but we have not taught them how to live. Magazines have refused articles of thought, in preference to shallow reporting of curious and useless facts. Art has worshipped the "fragments of a nightmare." We have become materialistic kings and spiritual paupers. We have forgotten that back of the face is the free soul.

Robert Heiman says, "The little people have intuitively discovered in the group endeavor a better satisfaction of their psychological needs than in the lonely, precarious life of the individual." Ralph Bates speaks of "that deep and haunting conviction that he is alone in a hostile and fearful world." Germany formalized as an escape. It is the natural reaction against a too complex world, but it is dangerous. A man may be made loyal to anything and then the loyalties clash. Man must learn to escape propaganda and live by reason again. Not all men can be philosophers but all men can demand that experiences such as those of the past two decades be repudiated, with the causes which brought them to us. The social gospel has been a great advance in religion but it has limited the church too much to the contemporary scene and measured men too much in material terms. It is time now to rediscover the individual Christian.

Having had experience as a newspaper cartoonist, I am plagued, when I first assume the pastorate of a new church, by the troublesome vision of long noses and short chins, of fat and cadaverous faces. But, as the years go by, the persons shine out through their expressions until some of the most peculiar faces are beautiful to me, because of radiant personalities, while some of the doll faces are empty. Leaves and trees and people are beautiful and of unending interest because of their differences. It is in our peculiarities that we are most fruitful.

Shall we not then go through life "seeing faces and not things," people rather than programs? Shall we not think more about how we can use the church to help the individual layman and less how we can use the layman to help the church?

Back of the egotistical Christian's face is his reading, his praying, his living, and his thought. The quality of his difference will depend on these things. There will be many pliant conformists to the spirit of any church. God be thanked for the nonconformist who sometimes holds us to deep truth instead of fashion, to personal experience of God instead of mere church respectability. Let us thank God for spiritually peculiar faces in the congregation, even for the egotistical Christian when he is wrong. He is at least a sign of the reality of thought. The future is in the hands of the minority. "Tomorrow's Pilgrims" are not conformists. First let us "make the world safe for differences," then let us examine the differences. Religion is best defined as "loyalty to the rational good" and "loyalty to universal values." But truth moves on and changes. It needs changing people. Ants are perfect cooperators but who wants to be an ant? Ants build ant hills but they do not build the new world.

Over There

When the frost had truly gripped,
When even my apricot
On her southern wall at length
Glittered like ribs of a shell
Above her leaves all stripped,
I gazed on my sparkling plot,
Glad that my will and strength
Had dug it early and well.

But the sharp wind blew the scent
From Europe's monstrous plain:
I saw the skeleton hosts,
The living leaf-frail ghosts,
Houseless, foodless, doomed,
To whom this brilliance meant
An eternal wail of pain,
The digging and digging of graves
For kinsfolk, then for themselves.
Gaunt as their sexton-staves,
Ash-grey as their mattock-helves,
They loomed and vanished and loomed.

Their digging would never be done,
They never would bury their dead.
Horror blotted the sun
And turned my heart to lead.

GEOFFREY JOHNSON.

The Study Table

Albert Schweitzer

PROPHET IN THE WILDERNESS. THE STORY OF ALBERT SCHWEITZER. *By Herman Hagedorn. New York: The Macmillan Company. $3.00.*

ALBERT SCHWEITZER, THE MAN AND HIS MIND. *By George Seaver. New York: Harper & Brothers. $3.75.*

ALBERT SCHWEITZER, AN ANTHOLOGY. *Edited by Charles R. Joy. Boston: Beacon Press. 323 pp. $3.75.*

On January 14 Albert Schweitzer was seventy-three years old. Of the almost three-quarter century of his life he has spent close to three decades in equatorial Africa, where he remains at work today, quite oblivious to the awe with which a world pays tribute to his versatility as well as to his utter devotion to the ideal of humble service of his fellow man. To a generation like ours, that has known so much of man's inhumanity to man, the knowledge that an individual such as Albert Schweitzer actually breathes, walks, and labors among us must be at once a heartening surprise and a great comfort. Reading about Schweitzer we understand anew what John meant when he wrote "and the word became flesh and dwelt among us."

When Albert Schweitzer was thirty years old, he had already impressed the world of scholarship and art as a philosopher, a theologian, an author of authentic works, a master organist, an authority on Bach, and a master organ-builder. At an age when most men have made their decision as to their life-work and career, this man—who at thirty might have settled down to a life of fame, comfort, and wealth in any of three or four capacities—decided, to the amazement

and consternation of his colleagues and friends, to devote himself to the ministry of "the least of these," i.e., to the work of a medical missionary among the primitives who were being served by a Protestant mission on the Ogowe River at Lamberene in French equatorial Africa. Thirty-five years ago he and his wife arrived at their African post. There have been interludes to their work; periods of several years at a time when the author of *The Quest, The Philosophy of Civilization, The Mysticism of Paul,* and a new and definitive edition of Bach's organ-works, and the distinguished maestro of the organ keyboard returned to Europe for concerts and lectures and literary work. But all these years his heart has been with his hospital and station on the Ogowe River where he heals diseased bodies, enlightens superstitious and primitive minds, and reveals the meaning of religion in terms of human service to simple folks who have known only fear of witch doctors, darkness of mind, and the tragedy of insecurity and uncertainty.

Dr. Schweitzer, honored time and again by the most famous universities of Europe with academic degrees and recognized throughout the world as an authentic voice in religion, philosophy, ethics, and music, is coming into his own today, and the two biographies by Hagedorn and Seaver, together with the Joy anthology, should do much to acquaint American readers especially with the life, thought, and remarkable achievements of this amazing man.

Herman Hagedorn tells the story of Dr. Schweitzer's life with that affectionate attention to detail that characterizes the poet whose imagination loves to dwell upon those vital personal minutiae that so easily escape the mere reporter and casual observer. Hagedorn's book is patently a labor of love, a warm tribute to a great soul. He has gone to the sources, has listened to eye and ear-witnesses, and his finished product is as reliable in its general outline and specific details as it is enthusiastic and moving. He frequently makes eloquent and accurate summaries of the personal traits and views of his subject as when he says: "Schweitzer was conscious of a mission, of which his work in Africa, his books, his lectures and his music, all were the multiple expression. The mission was definite—and clear: to wake men's sleeping souls and to make them think."

Or he quotes the testimony of great contemporaries of Schweitzer, as for example Stefan Sweig:

> In him one is aware of a power which, invisible to us, expresses itself in another continent in acts of mercy and ethical creativeness, and at the same time awakens or augments similar power in thousands of others. While he is resting here and chatting, he is actually the leader of an invisible host, the central point of a magical circle, who without exercising any external force, has yet released more power and achievement than dozens of political leaders, scholars and authoritarians.

And commenting on Schweitzer's Bach-playing, Sweig writes:

> Never have I felt Sebastian Bach's metaphysical power as I felt it in that Protestant church, awakened by a truly religious man and given substance there in utmost self-abnegation. Softly and mysteriously, as Schweitzer played the Advent Cantata, a chorale and then an improvisation, you felt the mighty music fill at the same time the dark body of the church and your own heart.

Hagedorn's biography is a poet's tribute to an artist; it will remain "definitive" in the sense that one artist's response to another is definitive as it catches the rhythm and heartbeat of a comrade.

George Seaver gave us four years ago his brief *Albert Schweitzer, Christian Revolutionary* of less than 130 pages. His latest volume is more than a biography: it is by all odds the most comprehensive discussion of the person and work of Schweitzer that we have, a profound exploration of the mind of the man, artist, thinker, and musician. Part I deals with the data of Schweitzer's childhood, youth, and manhood, and dwells particularly upon the four Lambarene periods ending with Schweitzer's return to Africa in 1939 after he had sensed the imminence of war. Part II deals with "His Thought" and is an appreciative and critical examination and interpretation of the major works produced by this uniquely versatile genius. In six carefully developed chapters, richly documented with quotations, the author introduces the reader to such famous works as "The Quest of the Historical Jesus," "The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle," "Indian Thought," "The Philosophy of Civilization," "Johann Sebastian Bach," etc. Chapter XVIII, "The Ethic of the Reverence for Life," is a brilliant summary of the central theme of Schweitzer's *Lebensanschauung* and *Weltanschauung,* revealing, as probably no other chapter written about Dr. Schweitzer, the doctor-theologian-philosopher-musician stature among men and his lasting contribution to mankind's reflections upon life and religion.

Of the *Anthology* its editor says, "this anthology represents an effort to make available much that is now scattered and hidden, to gather together those passages from published books and ephemeral writings which have meaning and inspiration for us today." Dr. Joy has put a man's job into the production of this anthology; he has read widely, selected carefully, and culled with excellent taste what is primary and of supreme significance in the writings of Schweitzer. The *Anthology* will serve as an excellent companion-piece to the two biographies here discussed.

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

The Language of Jesus

NEW TESTAMENT ORIGINS. *By George M. Lamsa. New York: Ziff-Davis Publishing Company. 104 pp. $2.00.*

The author of this important book is a native Assyrian whose mother tongue is Aramaic, the language Jesus and his disciples spoke. Mr. Lamsa's theory, which is well substantiated by competent scholars, is that the entire New Testament was originally written in Aramaic and later, as the new movement penetrated the Greek world, translated into Greek. This theory cannot be ignored today when new translations of the Bible are appearing constantly. The translators of the King James Version, of course, had no idea of the theory that the Greek was not the original; when, therefore, they came across difficult construction in Greek, they dismissed them as later forms, but now it is quite definitely established that they are attempts to render the Aramaic idiom into Koine Greek. Recently all reputable theological schools have added courses in Aramaic, or Syriac, to the curriculum and this is as it should be. Nobody can understand the Greek New Testament unless he knows the language in which the original was spoken. All serious Biblical students should read well this book.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Philosophy and Life

INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION. *By Stella Van Patten Henderson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 401 pp. $4.00.*

One of the encouraging signs in an otherwise discouraging period is that some educators, like the author of this book, take the position that a major, if not the major, purpose of education is to train future citizens to acquire the necessary insights that will enable them to direct social change toward the realization of a better social order.

The traditional or conventional conception held by the average citizen is that education is to train people for personal success in business or a profession. But, as the author points out in her introduction, "if teachers do not see how their work is related to the problem of social progress, man's suffering is sure to be greater than it need be and his advance slower than it should be."

The author wisely insists that if the prospective teacher is to be properly fitted for relating education to the problem of social progress it is essential that he should have a good grounding in philosophy. This "good grounding" in philosophy is essential, for if the prospective teacher is to discharge his function effectively he must have a good foundation in philosophy so that he will be able to develop a sound philosophy of life. It is impossible to direct wisely the social changes taking place today without an adequate foundation in philosophy and without a philosophy of life that has been carefully and critically thought out.

The bulk of the material in this book is directed toward providing the student teacher with a good background in philosophy. As the author puts it, "if teachers are to be successful in furthering human welfare, they need to study philosophy in order to apply it to the study of educational problems. Education cannot be understood apart from life."

Centuries ago Confucius roamed his native land trying to induce the ruler of a province to take him on as a philosopher-statesman. Finally, one ruler of a province did so. The record indicates that he was rather successful in passing the affairs of state through his philosophical mind. In other words, in applying philosophy to government.

How much better it is to begin at the beginning, i.e., with the potential citizen, by insisting that every prospective citizen should be trained in the science and art of applying the principles of philosophy to the most important thing in the world today, the direction of social change toward better, wiser, and nobler living. This, I take it, is essentially what Mrs. Henderson's book would accomplish, for in training our future teachers to think of education in this larger setting the end result will be the raising up of citizens who will be philosopher-statesmen.

At any rate it is certain that, if the point of view expressed in this book becomes generally accepted in our teacher training colleges, we can look forward to the appearance in our communities of teachers who will be making a very vital contribution to social progress and community welfare.

The philosophical background in this book is strongly Kantian, the religious outlook is that of a naturalistic theist, and the spirit back of it all is that of a genuine liberal. The material in this book has been tested through five years' use in the author's classes on the philosophy of education at Illinois State Normal University.

I believe those who are charged with the responsibility for the program of religious education in our churches will find that this book will provide them with a solid foundation for their important work. While written primarily for use with undergraduates in teacher training classes, it can be used advantageously by individuals outside the classroom, since the review questions at the end of each chapter will help the reader test his knowledge and understanding of the material in the chapter. Also, the bibliography at the end of each chapter will provide the reader with excellent supplementary material. The glossary of philosophical terms at the end of the book will help the beginner grasp the subject much more effectively. Of especial interest to the religious educator will be the chapters on "The Chief End of Man," "Components of the Good Life," "Morality and Moral Conduct," and "Freedom: Moral and Social."

KENNETH C. WALKER.

Unitarian Saint

THEODORE PARKER: YANKEE CRUSADER. *By Henry Steele Commager. Boston: The Beacon Press. 339 pp. $3.00.*

This is a volume of good understanding and good writing. Theodore Parker is presented vividly as a great personality. A contemporary of Channing and Emerson and Sumner, Parker won his reputation as preacher, philosopher, and reformer. There were giants in those days and Parker was one of them. He survived the attacks of the prevailing Unitarianism of his day and became a Unitarian saint of all days. One hundred years ago he was criticizing Unitarianism for using such words as "grace" and "salvation." He could be profitably re-read today. From the point of view of some Unitarians he is still a heretic but the vast majority have caught up with him and a new minority presses on in behalf of new heresies. It is to the credit of the nature and structure of the Unitarian movement that it can fight its battles, stake out new ground, absorb its heresies, and go on about its business of fostering freedom, fellowship, and character in religion.

CURTIS W. REESE.

Democratic Education

THE SCHOOL IN THE AMERICAN SOCIAL ORDER. *By Newton Edwards and Herman G. Richey. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 860 pp. $5.00.*

The subtitle to this exceedingly valuable book is "The Dynamics of American Education." It is a scholarly history of education in the United States. Do not let the word scholarly discourage you. It is interesting, dynamic reading.

It is a study in three parts: (1) The School in Colonial Society, (2) The School and the Emergence of the Democratic National State, and (3) The School in an Industrial Society.

We who are interested in a functioning democracy would do well to know what this book has to tell about the development of schools in this country. All about us people are clamoring for better schools. Bring up any modern problem and we hear "what we need is

education." The authors say in the final chapter, "Charting the Future Course,"

> In any civilization that has a sense of direction, that has moral commitments, the school has an important role to play in the processes of social transition. Certainly in an age such as ours, when the economic, political and ethical foundations of society are undergoing profound changes, teachers have a responsibility for the shape of things to come which they cannot in good conscience evade.

The world is on the move everywhere. I saw and felt the seething of tremendous change in China twenty years ago. It *is true* that humanity is on the march. It is therefore thrilling to read:

> The fact is that in the future common men are going to attend the party whether invited or not, and their standards of taste and their sense of the fitness of things may be at considerable variance from past standards. In the future, the task will be to translate esthetic standards from the museum and art gallery to the home and market-place, from the better residential districts to the slums, from creative artists and scholars to the man in the street.

JAMES M. YARD.

Artistic Production

WIT AND WISDOM OF WHITEHEAD. *Compiled by A. H. Johnson. Boston: Beacon Press. 102 pp. $2.50.*

The most outstanding attribute of this book is its layout. It is unusually attractive, artistic, and readable. The second most interesting feature about it is the very brief but intriguing glimpse of Whitehead's personality given in the preface and the biography. As for the compilation from Whitehead's writings it demonstrates more of his wit than his wisdom. However, there are in it many quotable "quotes" for homiletic and public speaking purposes.

RANDALL S. HILTON.

Towards Global Religion

PROBLEMS OF HUMANITY. *By Alice A. Bailey. New York: Lucis Publishing Co. 260 pp. $2.00.*

The author's knowledge of world events and vision of one humanity are manifest in this book. The first two of its chapters are entitled, respectively, "The Physical Reconstruction of the World" and "The Psychological Rehabilitation of the Nations." The remaining chapters are concerned with the problems of children, capital and labor, racial minorities, churches, and international unity.

This review will be limited to the chapter, "The Problem of the Churches." The Roman Catholic Church, the Protestant churches, and orothodox Judaism are severely criticized. "There are two major factors which are responsible for the failure of the churches: (1) Narrow theological interpretations of the Scriptures. (2) Material and political ambitions." The "regeneration" of the churches is "dependent upon certain changes in the fundamental attitudes of the leaders and teachers. . . ."

A "New World Religion" is the hope of the author. Certain terms are used to describe it, such as "spiritual Hierarchy," "the Coming One," "the Law of Rebirth," "Cyclic Approaches," "Science of Invocation and Evocation." This reviewer agrees that mankind needs to develop a global religion or life philosophy. Even liberal Protestant Christianity, though important, should be regarded as only a temporary step in the march toward a religion that is universal in teaching and outreach. But it is doubtful that such mystical language as "Cyclic Approaches" and the like will find much response in the minds of those who aim at uniting a rational world view, aesthetic sentiment, and social idealism in a universal religion.

JOHN H. HERSHEY.

Alternatives to Traditional Religion

THE CHURCH AND ORGANIZED MOVEMENTS. *Vol. II: The Interseminary Series. Edited by Randolph Crump Miller. New York: Harper & Brothers. 255 pp. $1.50.*

This is the second in the five-volume Interseminary Series which has rightfully caused such a stir in religious circles. One of the three main purposes of the series is to "outline the character of the contemporary world which challenges the Church." This particular volume attains this purpose to a remarkable degree, partly because it is the outcome of Commission discussions and then of invited authorship. The book is divided into three parts: the introductory perspective by Randolph Miller and Elton Trueblood, six essays on the "Contemporary Live Options" to organized Christianity, and a conclusion by Hugh Vernon White and Edward L. Parsons.

The portions of the book especially important to religious liberals are the six chapters which describe some of the options to traditional religion. Dr. George Hedley has an excellent chapter on secular radicalism or, as he chooses to call it, "The Anti-Opium League." It is prerequisite reading for those churchmen who still scoff at the political fact that "official anti-religionism" by Communists "is subordinated in practice to the effort to secure the cooperation of religious groups in a variety of specific causes." Howard Thurman contributes a chapter on "The Fascist Masquerade" which is not up to his usual standards. Concluding that "the Church ceases to be able to comfort the afflicted because it is afraid to afflict the comfortable," Dr. Buell G. Gallagher writes an answer to the question, "Welfare Work: Ally or Alternative?" Dr. Frederick West has a chapter on "Christianity and Organized Religion," generously admitting that "Humanism offers resources for the Christian program," despite its "tendency toward Christian atheism."

There is an important chapter on "The Cults," by Dr. Pierson Parker. It is an analytical essay, yet a sympathetic one, for Dr. Parker initially admits that "the cult stands as a reminder to the Church at large of a task which the Church ought herself to be about." Four kinds of cults are listed: (1) Non-Christian Movements, such as Bahaism, Ethical Culture (sic), Rosicrucianism, Spiritualism, Theosophy; (2) Metaphysical Christian Cults, especially Christian Science; (3) Quasi-Orthodox Cults, especially Mormons and Swedenborgians; and (4) Neo-Fundamentalist Movements, including the Assemblies of God, Jehovah's Witnesses, and Youth for Christ. Most of these groups happily make religious activity a primary concern for the adherent, but they also make a virtue of ignorance, offer a short cut to the good life, lack social vision, and involve much commercialism. Yet the Church has much to learn from the cult: (1) to reconstitute its

mission to the underprivileged; (2) to apply the truth that bodily health and spiritual health go hand in hand; and (3) to make religion not only clear, but absorbingly interesting and practically effective.

The most original chapter in the book is on "The Church and Organized Fraternalism," by Dr. Dwight C. Smith, a parish minister in Olympia, Washington. Dr. Smith made an informal survey of a small city of less than fifteen thousand inhabitants. He found nineteen congregations plus one Roman Catholic parish and one Jewish synagogue, with a total estimated membership of seven thousand and a constituency of ten thousand, or about one-half of the city's total population. Dr. Smith then investigated the many fraternal organizations. He found thirty-seven fraternal lodges, eleven service clubs, ten veteran's clubs and auxiliaries, five women's clubs, and one country club. This made a total of sixty-four fraternal organizations with an estimated membership of almost ten thousand persons. Dr. Smith thus concludes that "in the small-town environment in which their greatest strength lies, churches and fraternal groups are strikingly similar in numerical strength and also in their financial claims upon their respective constituencies."

Dr. Smith believes that tensions are developed "not so much in [churches and fraternities] claiming identical names on membership rolls as in demands made upon the time, interest, resources, and loyalty of members." Documenting the exclusiveness of fraternalism which finds expression in social, economic, religious, or racial superiority, the author wisely says that "the oft-quoted assertion that Jesus Christ was the first Rotarian is simply an exaggerated instance of the way in which essential secularism, expressing itself in uncritical self-congratulation, distorts the very essence of the Christian message." Yet, as with the cults, the Church has much to learn from fraternalism: the spirit of comradeship, practical service to others, world-wide perspective (at least in name), and certain decent standards of group conduct. The Church can denounce fraternalism or court it. Dr. Smith urges that the Church approach fraternalism as it really is, "a limited and often inadequate social phenomenon," and yet work with fraternalism "whenever it can without having its own standards subtly corrupted." This book is worth reading, doubly so for this chapter on the religion of the Elks and Lions down the street.

HOMER A. JACK.

Correspondence

Reply to Mr. Hammand

To UNITY:

Mr. Hammand, in his article "Why a World Police?", in the January-February issue of UNITY, demands an answer.

After rejoicing that we have no police at this time he concludes: "Let us give the United Nations time to grow and develop in a democratic way, for what it needs is not more rules or more teeth but more confidence and understanding."

I certainly am not unhappy that Washington and Hamilton did not take this attitude toward the Articles of Confederation. They found a very imperfect union and contrary to what Mr. Hammand writes they discarded it in favor of a Federal Union. Mr. Hammand says the Articles of Confederation grew very rapidly. The fact is that they died after a very hectic life of seven years with two wars, the Shays Rebellion and the War in the Wyoming Valley of Pennsylvania,—and some authorities say some ten other wars in the making.

We must make the U.N. into a Federal Union.

We need to unite national soldiers into an international police force, dedicated to the task of enforcing the laws of the U.N. If each nation joining the Federal Union of the U.N. gives up its right to decide matters in all ways except in court it certainly will not need any army, navy, or air force. The U.N. will need enough of these tools to be able to arrest any man or set of men anywhere in the union, and no more. This is not disarmament. And no honest man or set of men need fear such a world police force, because it will be used to enforce law and nothing else. And the more nations that come into the Federal Union, the less likelihood of its being misused.

We need to do to the U.N. what Hamilton did to the first U.S.A.,—make it into a Federal Union. Neither confidence nor understanding will cure the basic defect of the U.N. any more than it would have cured the defect in the U.S.A.

The U.S.A. had one advantage that the U.N. does not have. That is a common language. We need a common language if the U.N. is to be democratic. If the common people of the world are to take part in the U.N. they must be able to learn at first hand what is going on. This could be accomplished easily and quickly with a simple language like Esperanto, or after several more wars if we wait for the world to adopt Chinese or English or have Russian forced on us.

Madison, Wisconsin. GLENN P. TURNER.

Recollections

To UNITY:

My background is Universalist and I saw occasional copies of UNITY before 1890 and in 1893. While attending the Chicago World's Fair I visited All Souls' Church one Sunday morning in vacation time. In 1894 I was graduated from Tufts College and was ordained at Lynn, Massachusetts. In 1906 I became minister of the Elgin Universalist Church, and Mrs. Foster and I soon visited Lincoln Centre—the splendid new structure so recently completed. The Rev. C. A. Osborne acted as guide and we were shown throughout, even to the flagstaff on the roof. Later, Jenkin Lloyd Jones came out to Elgin one Sunday evening and gave one of his famed lectures. It is so pleasant to recall his personality and his friendly courtesies. To so many he typified the higher life of wonderful Chicago.

To anyone who knew Lincoln Centre in earlier days, it is a deep satisfaction that the great work is so worthily sustained.

A. N. FOSTER.

Lexington, Mass.

Western Conference News

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

A DEDICATION

We cannot fondle an idea as we can a warm, sweet baby. We cannot with all our spiritual and physical being love an idea as we do our best beloved. We cannot gaze with adoration at an idea as we do when we gaze upon children.

An idea is an intangible concept, as fragile as a butterfly's wings, stronger than the strongest combination of elements man has ever wrought. Free religious thinkers through the ages have loved the idea of the free mind. Loved it enough to suffer, to bleed, to die. We are moved to wonder, to exultation, to emulate when we hear of such selfless devotion.

The Unitarian heritage is a moving, inspiring heritage. A history of a group of people who above all else were dedicated to the search for truth. As the Hebrew dedicated himself to the search for God and Jesus dedicated himself to the people, so Unitarians have dedicated themselves to the free use of the mind. That commitment led them to establish a free government, a free press, free schools, and a church free from the authority of man-created limitations. Ours is a priceless inheritance which only men likewise committed can preserve.

Merrill Otis Bates, Grosse Pointe.

UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY

A function of the Liberal Church is to celebrate, strengthen, and give contemporary relevance to the Judeo-Christian ethos, recognizing in it a faithful source of inspiration toward justice and love in human affairs.

The Liberal Church, however, need not be exclusively Christian. Some of the most valuable contributions Christianity has for us are in the interests of universal understanding brotherhood. The very Christianity that identifies us also liberates us and motivates us to try ever and again to seek those understandings and reconciliations that increasingly effect harmony and shared insights within the human family and all its cultural divisions.

The Christian must ever keep in mind that men may be motivated outside the Judeo-Christian ethos, whether in the Orient or within the non-Christian areas of Western life, in this same direction and with emotional and intellectual power.

Christian and non-Christian need not be mutually exclusive and may share large areas of meaning and experience held in common. An equally important function of the Liberal Church is to further the process of realizing common areas of meaning and experience.

Paul Franklin Bliss, in a paper presented to the Greenfield Group.

MORE THAN CHRISTIANITY

Just as literature knows no barriers, just as art knows no barriers, just as science looks upon research and investigation accepting everything of value that is given without regard to nationality, race, or color, so I want my church to accept from the world of humanity all that is of value without regard to sectarian religious labels. I want to use the word "Christian" when "Christian" is meant. But I wish that all men might use the word humanitarian when they mean humanitarian, for in using that word the Spirit of One World will be less divided and more united. . . .

Overarching all men is the common denominator—Man! When we unite as men, as members of one great fellowship that excludes none and includes all—HUMANITY—when we give to that word the reverence and sacredness it alone can command from us all, we shall have a true spiritual basis for One World.

Religion is more than Christianity!

Arthur W. Olsen, Toledo.

A UNITARIAN AGREEMENT

A Unitarian Christian is
A man who rarely feels
Contrition for his own misdeeds
But in repentance kneels
Each Sunday for the unbelief
Non-Christians do profess,
While they in turn concede no grief
O'er their unholiness
But are a bit inclined to pan
The Christian Unitarians
Who seem to them no better than
The creedal trinitarians!

Robert T. Weston, Louisville.

MY CHURCH

MY CHURCH is a privilege:—for I have seen many of my brethren in other lands deprived of their church.

MY CHURCH is a duty:—for if I do not support it today, it may not be there to serve me when I need it tomorrow.

MY CHURCH is a challenge:—for if I fail to practice its teachings, I am not so good a parent, helpmate, neighbor or citizen.

MY CHURCH is a pleasure:—for it shows me the way to happier living and opens doors of precious friendship.

MY CHURCH IS WHAT I MAKE IT.

Kenneth C. Walker, Bloomington.

THE EGOTIST

The egotist expects life will revolve around his personality. He expects the sun to shine for him; the earth to yield her fruits to him personally; that men will bring the treasures of their hearts and minds and fill his cornucopia.

He has the impudence to pray for these things. He has told God he will worship and praise Him if He would grant him an eternity of bliss.

Of course, the time comes when he discovers that the music of the world is not keyed to his little pitch-pipe.

Frank S. C. Wicks, Indianapolis.

SUPREME COURT DECISION

The eight-to-one decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Case of Mrs. Vashti McCollum vs. the School Board of Champaign, Illinois, was a signal victory for the forces fighting for the maintenance of the separation of Church and State. It brought to a successful conclusion three years of litigation in which the first two decisions, in the Circuit and Supreme Courts of Illinois, went against the plaintiff. While the decision is clear in ruling as illegal the teaching of sectarian religion in the public schools on public school

time, it is not clear as to how it will affect programs set up on the basis of dismissing school early for classes in neighboring churches. Another case should be brought, and no doubt will be, to ascertain full meaning of the Court's decision.

It was three years ago in March that the Released Time Committee of the Chicago Action Council sent out a circular letter to some 1,500 ministers in the State of Illinois. The letter was signed by Randall S. Hilton, Chairman. Joining with Mr. Hilton in signing the letter were Rev. Paul J. Folino, then Director of the Chicago Regional Action Committee of the Protestant; Mrs. Scott B. Eaton, Vice President of the Association for Family Living; Ira Latimer, Executive Secretary of the Chicago Civil Liberties Committee; Professor Walker Alderton and Professor Ernest J. Chave, both of the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago; Dr. Homer A. Jack, Director of the Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination; Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein, Temple K. A. M., Chicago; Rev. William J. Arms, Universalist Church, Peoria; and the following Unitarian ministers: John N. Booth, G. Richard Kuch, Robert Murray Pratt, Philip Schug, and Gerald F. Weary. The Reverend Mr. Schug, then the minister in Urbana, published the letter in his church paper. Mrs. McCollum read the letter and offered to bring the suit if the Chicago Action Council would finance it. This the Action Council did and carried it through to the Supreme Court of the United States. The original demand served upon the Champaign School Board was signed by Mrs. McCollum, Randall S. Hilton, Paul J. Folino, Jacob J. Weinstein, Ira Latimer, and Robert Greenfield for the Chicago Action Council. Mr. Schug did yeoman's work as liaison officer between the Action Council and Mrs. McCollum. His untiring efforts not only contributed to the prosecution of the case but on at least one occasion prevented the State Legislature from passing an enabling law attempting to legalize the Champaign procedure. Attorney Landon Chapman started the suit which was later prosecuted before the Supreme Courts of Illinois and the United States by Dr. Walter Dodd, a ranking constitutional lawyer and former professor of Constitutional Law at Northwestern University.

The Western Unitarian Conference and the American Unitarian Association were active in support of the cause by both resolutions and the activities of their officers. Last November the American Unitarian Association filed a brief, *amicus curiae,* with the Supreme Court of the United States. The brief was prepared by Mr. Frank Frederick, counsel for the Association.

Officials in the Division of Education of the American Unitarian Association and of the Western Unitarian Conference have gone on record to continue the vigil for maintaining the separation of Church and State, particularly in the public schools. The Supreme Court decision does not warrant relaxing the watchfulness and opposition to released and dismissed time programs. It also increases the necessity of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the local church's religious education activities.

PROTESTANTS UNITED

Protestants United for the Separation of Church and State is a new organization with a wide following and much potential power. It is headed by Dr. Edwin M. Poteat, President of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. Rev. Merrill O. Bates, minister of the Unitarian Church of Grosse Pointe, Michigan, is a member of its Board. Mrs. Dudley Moore, Director of Education for the Detroit Unitarian Church, is a member of the advisory council. Methods of cooperation between Protestants United and the Adult Education and Social Relations Department of the American Unitarian Association are now under consideration.

MINISTER-AT-LARGE

The Rev. Grant Butler, Minister of the Des Moines Unitarian Church, has been elected Minister-at-large for the American Unitarian Association. He will begin his duties on August first. The work of the Unitarian Extension and Church Maintenance Department has so increased that another minister-at-large has become necessary. Mr. Butler is the second Western Conference man to be appointed to this position. Rev. Lon Ray Call left the secretaryship of the Western Conference to accept such an appointment in 1941, which position he still holds. Unitarians are familiar with the new churches he has organized and the work he has been doing.

Mr. Butler is eminently qualified for this undertaking. His appointment further assures Unitarian advance.

MARQUETTE PARK RETREAT

The Unitarian and Univeralist ministers held a joint retreat at Marquette State Park, Grafton, Illinois, April 6-9. The leaders for the sessions were Dr. Merrill Bush, Director of the Department of Adult Education and Social Relations for the A.U.A., Emerson Lalone, Editor of the Christian Leader, and Rev. Duncan Howlett, Minister of First Church, Boston, and Chairman of the Unitarian Commission on Planning and Review.

CONFERENCE MEETINGS

The Western Unitarian Conference will hold its annual sessions May 13-16 at Cincinnati, Ohio. It will begin with a public lecture on Wednesday night and close with the morning service at the First Unitarian Church, Sunday, May 16. A rich and varied program is being planned by the program committee. The committee consists of A. W. Broomell (First Church, Cincinnati), chairman; Julius F. Krolfifer (St. John's Church, Cincinnati), Mrs. E. G. Luening (Louisville), Harold Marley (Dayton), and Randall S. Hilton (Chicago), secretary.

The general headquarters will be at the First Unitarian Congregational Church, 2901 Reading Road, Cincinnati. The Executive Secretary's office will be at the Vernon Manor Hotel. Those planning to attend the Cincinnati meetings who desire either hotel accommodations or hospitality in a home are asked to write Mrs. E. S. Lutton, 5656 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati 13, Ohio.

RECENT VISITORS

The following people from the Boston offices have recently made visits in the Western Conference area: George G. Davis, Director of the Department of Unitarian Extension; Duncan Howlett, Chairman of the Commission on Planning and Review; Melvin Arnold, Director of the Division of Publications, Edward J. Darling, News Editor of the *Christian Register,* and Lois McColloch, Field Worker of the General Alliance.